

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 17, 1998

LB 309

without there having been some other underlying violation that justified going into this part. I am not going to yield at this point to the temptation to try to retain that language requiring the first violation to exist before the .02 as a secondary violation can come into play. If all that you do is strike the requirement of the other violation, here's what you have. A cop can stop any young person under 21 years of age and say that he has reasonable grounds to suspect that this person was driving with a concentration of .02 in his or her system. Point 02 causes no impairment. The person is not weaving in the car. The person, if made to get out of the car, does not stagger or wobble. The person can recite the alphabet forward and backward, start in the middle and go both directions at the same time or simultaneously. What is it that would create reasonable grounds? Practically nothing. So here's what my amendment would do. It would say that since the concentration of alcohol is so low the standard that an officer should have to meet in order to subject a person to these tests should be raised, so it should go from reasonable grounds to probable cause. That's what the amendment would do. Instead of saying that an officer must have only reasonable grounds, which would be the lowest standard you could have to subject somebody under 21 years old to this process, the officer would have to have probable cause to believe that such person was driving or was in actual physical control of a motor vehicle in violation of the .02 law. The second part of this amendment would deal with the last line in subsection (2). According to the law as it exists now, refusal to submit would lead to a person mandatorily being arrested. All of us were young at one time. That's hard for the youngsters here to believe. They wouldn't believe that in anything less than a hundred years could you start out in infancy and reach the point where we find ourselves today, but some of us managed to achieve that result in less than 100 years. When there had to be an underlying offense before the .02 could be enforced as a secondary violation, maybe it was all right to arrest somebody for refusal. I don't know. But since there need be no underlying offense, refusal should not carry a greater punishment than actual guilt of the offense. The offense is having .02 in your blood at the time you are driving the vehicle. If you are convicted of actually having .02, that is merely a traffic infraction. What my amendment would do is to make refusal a traffic infraction. You